arXiv:1405.6578v1 [cs.MA] 26 May 2014

A Parallel Elicitation-Free Protocol for Allocating Indivisible Goods

Wei Huang[1], **Jian Lou**[1], and **Zhonghua Wen**[2]
1. School of Computer Science and Technology, USTC, Hefei, China
huangbodao@gmail.com, loujian@mail.ustc.edu.cn
2. College of Information Engineering, Xiangtan University, Xiangtan, China
zhonghua@xtu.edu.cn

Abstract

We study the problem of allocating a set of indivisible goods to multiple agents. Recent work [Bouveret and Lang, 2011] focused on allocating goods in a sequential way, and studied what is the "best" sequence of agents to pick objects based on utilitarian or egalitarian criterion. In this paper, we propose a parallel elicitation-free protocol for allocating indivisible goods. In every round of the allocation process, some agents will be selected (according to some policy) to report their preferred objects among those that remain, and every reported object will be allocated randomly to an agent reporting it. Empirical comparison between the parallel protocol (applying a simple selection policy) and the sequential protocol (applying the optimal sequence) reveals that our proposed protocol is promising. We also address strategical issues.

1 Introduction

How to allocate resources among multiple agents in an efficient, effective, and fair way is one of the most important sustainability problems. Recently it has become an emerging research topic in AI. Many centralized approaches to allocating indivisible goods have been proposed (e.g., in [Cramton *et al.*, 2006]). In these approaches, agents are required to fully reveal their preferences to some central authority (which computes the final allocation) and pay for the resources allocated to them at some prices. However, there are some drawbacks and limitations of these approaches:

- the elicitation process and the winner determination algorithm can be very expensive;
- agents have to reveal their full preferences, which they might be reluctant to do (sometimes an elicitation process is unwelcome);
- in many real world situations (e.g., assigning courses to students [Kalinowski *et al.*, 2012; Budish and Cantillon, 2012], and providing employment training opportunities to unemployed), resources must be allocated free and monetary side payments [Chevaleyre *et al.*, 2010] are impossible or unwelcome.

So it is important to design a decentralized elicitation-free protocol for allocating indivisible goods. [Brams *et al.*, 2012] adapted a cake-cutting protocol (a typical decentralized approach for the allocation of divisible goods [Chen *et al.*, 2010]) to the allocation of indivisible goods. However, the protocol is typically designed for the cases when there are only two agents. [Bouveret and Lang, 2011] studied a sequential elicitation-free protocol. By applying this protocol, any number of objects can be allocated to any number of agents. The sequential protocol is parameterized by a sequential policy (i.e., a sequence of agents). Agents take turns to pick objects according to the sequence when the allocation process begins.

In this paper, we define and study a parallel elicitation-free protocol for allocating indivisible goods to multiple agents. According to this protocol, a parallel policy (i.e., an agent selection policy) has to be defined before the public allocation process can begin. At each stage of the allocation process, some agents will be selected (according to the parallel policy) to publicly report their preferred objects among those that remain, and every reported object will be allocated to an agent reporting it. If an object is reported by more than one agent, then the agents reporting it draw lots and the winner could get it. We give a general definition of parallel policies, which can consider the allocation history that had happened; and provide eight different criteria to measure the social welfare induced by parallel policies.

In fact, any sequential policy applied in the sequential protocol is in a specific class of parallel policies that are sensitive to identities. The social welfare criteria considered in [Bouveret and Lang, 2011] and [Kalinowski *et al.*, 2012] are three of the eight criteria proposed in our paper. We introduce two simple parallel policies (i.e., ϖ_A and ϖ_L), which are insensitive to identities; and compare ϖ_A and the optimal sequential policies (for small numbers of objects and agents) with respect to the three social welfare criteria. The results show that the parallel protocol is promising because ϖ_A outperforms the optimal sequential policies in most cases.

We further consider strategical issues under ϖ_A. We show that an agent who knows the preferences of other agents can find in polynomial time whether she has a strategy for getting a given set of objects regardless of uncertainty arising from lottery. We also show that if the scoring function of the manipulator is lexicographic, computing an optimal strategy in

the sense of pessimism is polynomial.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 briefly reviews the basics of the sequential protocol. Section 3 presents the parallel protocol and introduces the two specific parallel policies (i.e., ϖ_A and ϖ_L). Section 4 compares ϖ_A and sequential policies with respect to several social welfare criteria. Section 5 considers strategical issues under ϖ_A. Section 6 summarizes the contributions of this work and discusses future work.

2 Preliminaries

A set of m indivisible objects $\mathcal{O} = \{o_1, \ldots, o_m\}$ need to be allocated free to a set of n agents $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. It is supposed that $m \geq n$ and all agents have strict preferences. $\succ_i$ denotes agent i's ordinal preference (which is a total strict order) over $\mathcal{O}$, and $rank_i(o) \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ denotes the rank of object o in $\succ_i$. A *profile* R consists of a collection of rankings, one for each agent: $R = \langle \succ_1, \ldots, \succ_n \rangle$; $Prof(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{N})$ denotes the set of possible profiles under $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{N}$. In the following discussion, if not specified, we only consider full independence case, where all preference orderings are equally probable (i.e., $Pr(R) = \frac{1}{(m!)^n}$ for every $R \in Prof(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{N})$).

Agent i's value function $u_i : 2^{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathbb{R}$ specifies her valuation $u_i(B)$ on each bundle B with $u_i(\emptyset) = 0$. When $B = \{o\}$, we also write $u_i(B)$ as $u_i(o)$. For any $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $B \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{O}}$, and $o \in \mathcal{O}$, it is assumed that:

- u_i is additive, i.e., $u_i(B) = \sum_{o' \in B} u(o')$; and
- $u_i(o) = g(rank_i(o))$, where g is a non-increasing function from $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$.

g is called the scoring function. g is convex if $g(x) - g(x+1) \geq g(y) - g(y+1)$ holds for any $x \leq y$. In this paper, we focus on two prototypical convex scoring functions (let $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$): (*Borda*) $g_B(k) = m - k + 1$, and (*lexicographic*) $g_L(k) = 2^{m-k}$.

In the sequential protocol, agents take turns to pick objects according to a *sequential policy* $\pi \in \mathcal{N}^m$. $\pi(i)$ denotes the i^{th} agent designated by π. Given π and a profile $R = \langle \succ_1, \ldots, \succ_n \rangle$, if all the agents act truthfully, then the corresponding allocation history h^{π}_R is $\langle \pi(1), o'_1 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \pi(m), o'_m \rangle$ (i.e., agent $\pi(k)$ picks object o'_k at time k), where $o'_k \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \{o'_l | 1 \leq l < k\}$ and $o'_k \succ_{\pi(k)} o$ for every $o \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \{o'_l | 1 \leq l \leq k\}$. Given a scoring function g, agent i's utility at π and R (i.e., $u_i(\pi, R)$) and i's expected utility at π (i.e., $u^*_i(\pi)$) are:

$$u_i(\pi, R) = \sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}_i} g(rank_i(o))$$

where $\mathcal{O}_i = \{o'_k | 1 \leq k \leq m \ s.t. \ \pi(k) = i\}$, and

$$u^*_i(\pi) = \frac{\sum_{R \in Prof(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{N})} u_i(\pi, R)}{(m!)^n}$$

Given an aggregation function F (which is a symmetric, non-decreasing function from $(\mathbb{R}^+)^n$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$), the expected social welfare of a sequential policy π is defined as:

$$sw^*_F(\pi) = F(u^*_1(\pi), \ldots, u^*_n(\pi)).$$

Sequential policy π is optimal for $\langle \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{N}, g, F \rangle$ if $sw^*_F(\pi) \geq sw^*_F(\pi')$ for every $\pi' \in \mathcal{N}^m$.

[Bouveret and Lang, 2011] considered two typical aggregation functions which correspond to the utilitarian criterion $F_u(u_1, \ldots, u_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i$ and the Rawlsian egalitarian criterion $F_e(u_1, \ldots, u_n) = \min\{u_i | 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. They also showed that, strict alternation (i.e., $12 \ldots n12 \ldots n \ldots$) is optimal for $\langle \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{N}, g_B, F_u \rangle$ when $m \leq 12$ and $n = 2$, and $m \leq 10$ and $n = 3$. But they did not know whether this is true for every m and n.

The following example is modified from the one given in [Bouveret and Lang, 2011]. It illustrates the notions introduced in this section and will be used throughout the paper.

Example 1 *Let $m = 5$, $n = 3$, and $\pi = 12332$. Then $\langle u^*_1(\pi), u^*_2(\pi), u^*_3(\pi) \rangle$ is $\langle 5, 7.2, 7.5 \rangle$ under g_B, and $\langle 16, 17.8667, 17 \rangle$ under g_L. Consequently, $sw^*_{F_u}(\pi) = 19.7$ under g_B, $sw^*_{F_e}(\pi) = 16$ under g_L, etc.*

Suppose $R = \langle \succ_1, \succ_2, \succ_3 \rangle$ s.t. $\succ_1 = o_1 \succ o_2 \succ o_3 \succ o_4 \succ o_5$, $\succ_2 = o_4 \succ o_2 \succ o_5 \succ o_1 \succ o_3$, and $\succ_3 = o_1 \succ o_3 \succ o_5 \succ o_4 \succ o_2$. Then $h^{\pi}_R = \langle 1, o_1 \rangle \langle 2, o_4 \rangle \langle 3, o_3 \rangle \langle 3, o_5 \rangle \langle 2, o_2 \rangle$. $\langle u_1(\pi, R), u_2(\pi, R), u_3(\pi, R) \rangle$ is $\langle 5, 9, 7 \rangle$ under g_B, and $\langle 16, 24, 12 \rangle$ under g_L.

3 Parallel Protocol and Policies

Now we introduce a parallel protocol for allocating indivisible goods. At each stage t of the allocating process, there is a designated set of agents $\mathcal{N}_t \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ s.t. each $i \in \mathcal{N}_t$ reports an object (her preferred object among those that remain). If object o is reported by only one agent then it is allocated to the agent, otherwise the agents demanding o draw lots [1] for the right to get o.

The protocol is parameterized by a parallel policy. Formally, a parallel policy is a function $\varpi : (2^{\mathcal{N}} \times 2^{\mathcal{N}})^* \to 2^{\mathcal{N}}$. Given a finite sequence $\sigma = \langle \mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}'_1 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \mathcal{N}_k, \mathcal{N}'_k \rangle$ (where for every $1 \leq l \leq k$, $\mathcal{N}_l$ is the set of agents reporting at stage l, and $\mathcal{N}'_l \subset \mathcal{N}_l$ is the set of agents losing some lottery at stage l), ϖ designates the set of agents reporting at stage $k+1$. An allocation history induced by ϖ is in the form of $\langle \mathcal{O}_1, D_1 \rangle \mathcal{N}'_1 \langle \mathcal{O}_2, D_2 \rangle \mathcal{N}'_2 \ldots \langle \mathcal{O}_p, D_p \rangle \mathcal{N}'_p$ STOP, where (suppose $1 \leq k \leq p$, and $1 \leq l < p$):

- $\mathcal{O}_1 = \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{N}_1 = \varpi(\epsilon)$[2];
- $D_k : \mathcal{N}_k \to \mathcal{O}_k$, $\mathcal{O}'_k = \{o \in \mathcal{O}_k | \exists i \in \mathcal{N}_k . D_k(i) = o\}$, $\mathcal{N}'_k \subset \mathcal{N}_k$ s.t. $\forall o \in \mathcal{O}'_k | \{i \in \mathcal{N}_k \setminus \mathcal{N}'_k | D_k(i) = o\}| = 1$;
- $\mathcal{O}_{l+1} = \mathcal{O}_l \setminus \mathcal{O}'_l, \mathcal{N}_{l+1} = \varpi(\langle \mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{N}'_1 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \mathcal{N}_l, \mathcal{N}'_l \rangle)$;
- $\mathcal{O}_k \neq \emptyset, \emptyset \subset \mathcal{N}_k \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, and $\mathcal{O}_p = \mathcal{O}'_p$.

Intuitively, at stage k, $\mathcal{O}_k$ is the set of objects remaining, $\mathcal{O}'_k$ is the set of objects reported by some $i \in \mathcal{N}_k$, and for every $i \in \mathcal{N}_k$, $D_k(i)$ is the object reported by i. $\langle \mathcal{O}_k, D_k \rangle$ is called the *demand situation* at k, and STOP is called the *termination situation*.

Given a parallel policy ϖ and a profile $R = \langle \succ_1, \ldots, \succ_n \rangle$, if all the agents act truthfully, the set of possible histories can be represented as an allocation structure $\mathrm{S}^{\varpi}_R = \langle \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E} \rangle$ s.t. $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ are the minimal sets satisfying the following rules:

[1] We suppose the lot is fair, i.e., if there are k agents drawing lots then each one of these agents has $1/k$ chance of winning the lot.

[2] ϵ denotes the empty sequence.

- $\langle \mathcal{O}, D : \varpi(\epsilon) \to \mathcal{O} \rangle \in \mathcal{V}$ s.t. $rank_i(D(i)) = 1$ for every $i \in \varpi(\epsilon)$;
- if there exists a history $h = \ldots \langle \mathcal{O}_k, D_k \rangle \mathcal{N}'_k \langle \mathcal{O}_{k+1}, D_{k+1} \rangle \ldots$ induced by ϖ such that:
  - $\langle \mathcal{O}_k, D_k \rangle \in \mathcal{V}$, and
  - $\forall i \in \mathcal{N}_{k+1} \forall o \in \mathcal{O}_{k+1} \setminus \{D_{k+1}(i)\}. D_{k+1}(i) \succ_i o$,

  then $\langle \langle \mathcal{O}_k, D_k \rangle, \mathcal{N}'_k, \langle \mathcal{O}_{k+1}, D_{k+1} \rangle \rangle \in \mathcal{E}$, and $\langle \mathcal{O}_{k+1}, D_{k+1} \rangle \in \mathcal{V}$;
- STOP $\in \mathcal{V}$, and if there exists a history $h = \ldots \langle \mathcal{O}_k, D_k \rangle \mathcal{N}'_k$ STOP induced by ϖ s.t. $\langle \mathcal{O}_k, D_k \rangle \in \mathcal{V}$ then $\langle \langle \mathcal{O}_k, D_k \rangle, \mathcal{N}'_k, \text{STOP} \rangle \in \mathcal{E}$.

It is easy to find that S_R^{ϖ} is acyclic, and $\langle \mathcal{O}, D \rangle$ is the root.

Since the allocation process from some demand situation $v \in \mathcal{V}$ is nondeterministic in general, each rational agent i is often concerned with her expected utility $\hat{u_i}(v)$ and the minimal utility $\underline{u_i}(v)$ that she can get regardless of uncertainty. Formally, given a scoring function g, $\hat{u_i}(v) = \underline{u_i}(v) = 0$ if $v = \text{STOP}$; otherwise (suppose $v = \langle \mathcal{O}', D' : \mathcal{N}' \to \mathcal{O}' \rangle$):

$$\hat{u_i}(v) = w + \frac{\sum_{v' \in \mathcal{V}} \#E^v_{v'} \cdot \hat{u_i}(v')}{\#out_v}$$

$$\underline{u_i}(v) = \min\{\underline{u_i}(\mathcal{N}'', v') | \langle v, \mathcal{N}'', v' \rangle \in \mathcal{E}\}, \quad \text{where}$$

- $w = \frac{g(rank_i(D'(i)))}{|\{j \in \mathcal{N}' | D'(j) = D'(i)\}|}$ if $i \in \mathcal{N}'$, $w = 0$ otherwise;
- $\#E^v_{v'} = |\{\mathcal{N}'' \subset \mathcal{N} | \langle v, \mathcal{N}'', v' \rangle \in \mathcal{E}\}|$;
- $\#out_v = |\{\langle \mathcal{N}'', v' \rangle \in 2^{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{V} | \langle v, \mathcal{N}'', v' \rangle \in \mathcal{E}\}|$;
- $\underline{u_i}(\mathcal{N}'', v') = \underline{u_i}(v')$ if $i \in \mathcal{N}'' \cup (\mathcal{N} \setminus \mathcal{N}')$, $\underline{u_i}(\mathcal{N}'', v') = \underline{u_i}(v') + g(rank_i(D'(i)))$ otherwise.

$\hat{u_i}(\varpi, R) = \hat{u_i}(v)$ and $\underline{u_i}(\varpi, R) = \underline{u_i}(v)$ are called agent i's expected utility and minimum utility at ϖ and R, respectively, where v is the root of S_R^{ϖ}.

Each agent $i \in \mathcal{N}$ can evaluate a given parallel policy ϖ according to 4 values, i.e., $v_i(y, z, \varpi)$ where:

- $y, z \in \{\mathsf{u}, \mathsf{e}\}$,
- $v_i(\mathsf{u}, z, \varpi) = \frac{\sum_{R \in Prof(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{N})} u_i(z, \varpi, R)}{(m!)^n}$,
- $v_i(\mathsf{e}, z, \varpi) = \min\{u_i(z, \varpi, R) | R \in Prof(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{N})\}$,
- $u_i(\mathsf{u}, \varpi, R) = \hat{u_i}(\varpi, R)$, and $u_i(\mathsf{e}, \varpi, R) = \underline{u_i}(\varpi, R)$.

The social welfare induced by ϖ (i.e., $sw(x, y, z, \varpi)$) can be measured by the 8 possible orderings over 3 elements taken from $\{\mathsf{u}, \mathsf{e}\}$. Formally, $x, y, z \in \{\mathsf{u}, \mathsf{e}\}$, $sw(\mathsf{u}, y, z, \varpi) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i(y, z, \varpi)$, and $sw(\mathsf{e}, y, z, \varpi) = \min\{v_i(y, z, \varpi) | 1 \le i \le n\}$[3].

Any sequential policy π can be seen as a parallel policy ϖ_π s.t. $\varpi_\pi(\epsilon) = \pi(1)$ and $\varpi_\pi(\sigma_k) = \pi(k+1)$ for every $1 \le k < m$, where $\sigma_k = \langle \{\pi(1)\}, \emptyset \rangle, \ldots, \langle \{\pi(k)\}, \emptyset \rangle$. For every profile R, there is only one possible history in $\mathrm{S}_R^{\varpi_\pi}$. So $\hat{u_i}(\varpi_\pi, R) = \underline{u_i}(\varpi_\pi, R) = u_i(\pi, R)$, $v_i(\mathsf{u}, z, \varpi_\pi) = u_i^*(\pi)$, and $sw(x, \mathsf{u}, \mathsf{u}, \varpi_\pi) = sw^*_{F_x}(\pi)$.

In this paper, we introduce two specific parallel policies: *all–reporting* ϖ_A, where all the agents report at every stage, and *loser–reporting* ϖ_L, where all the agents losing some lot at the current stage report at the next stage. Formally, $\varpi_A(\sigma) = \mathcal{N}$ for any sequence σ; $\varpi_L(\epsilon) = \mathcal{N}$, and

$$\varpi_L(\ldots, \langle \mathcal{N}_k, \mathcal{N}'_k \rangle) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}'_k & \text{if } \mathcal{N}'_k \neq \emptyset \\ \mathcal{N} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

ϖ_L guarantees that every agent can get $\frac{m}{n}$ objects at least. So in the eyes of pessimists, it may be a better choice than ϖ_A.

Note that neither ϖ_A nor ϖ_L mentions identities of agents. We called this kind of parallel policies are insensitive to identities. We can get Lemma 1 directly.



Figure 1: Allocation structures of ϖ_A and ϖ_L

Lemma 1 *Let parallel policy ϖ be insensitive to identities. Then for every $y, z \in \{\mathsf{u}, \mathsf{e}\}$, and $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, we have $v_i(y, z, \varpi) = v_j(y, z, \varpi)$, and $sw(\mathsf{u}, y, z, \varpi) = n \cdot v_i(y, z, \varpi) = n \cdot sw(\mathsf{e}, y, z, \varpi)$.*

Example 2 *Consider the situation depicted in Example 1. Figure 1 shows the allocation structures of ϖ_A and ϖ_L, where (let $1 \le p \le 3$, $1 \le q \le 5$, and ud denote the undefined value):*

- $v_p = \langle \mathcal{O}_p, D_p : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{O}_p \rangle$, $v'_q = \langle \mathcal{O}'_q, D'_q : \mathcal{N}'_q \to \mathcal{O}'_q \rangle$;
- $\mathcal{O}_1 = \mathcal{O}'_1 = \mathcal{O}$, $\mathcal{O}_2 = \mathcal{O}'_2 = \mathcal{O}'_3 = \{2, 3, 5\}$, $\mathcal{O}_3 = \{5\}$, $\mathcal{O}'_4 = \{3, 5\}$, *and* $\mathcal{O}'_5 = \{2, 5\}$;
- $\mathcal{N}'_1 = \mathcal{N}'_4 = \mathcal{N}'_5 = \mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{N}'_2 = \{1\}$, *and* $\mathcal{N}'_3 = \{3\}$;
- $d_p \in (\mathcal{O}_p)^{|\mathcal{N}|}$ *s.t.* $d_p[i] = D_p(i)$ *for every* $i \in \mathcal{N}$, *i.e.*, $d_1 = \langle 1, 4, 1 \rangle$, $d_2 = \langle 2, 2, 3 \rangle$, *and* $d_3 = \langle 5, 5, 5 \rangle$; *and*
- $d'_q \in (\mathcal{O}'_q \cup \{\mathsf{ud}\})^{|\mathcal{N}|}$ *s.t.* $d'_q[i] = D'_q(i)$ *if* $i \in \mathcal{N}'_q$, *otherwise* $d'_q[i] = \mathsf{ud}$, *i.e.*, $d'_1 = \langle 1, 4, 1 \rangle$, $d'_2 = \langle 2, \mathsf{nd}, \mathsf{nd} \rangle$, $d'_3 = \langle \mathsf{nd}, \mathsf{nd}, 3 \rangle$, $d'_4 = \langle 3, 5, 3 \rangle$, *and* $d'_5 = \langle 2, 2, 5 \rangle$.

Under g_B, $\langle \hat{u}_1(\varpi_A, R), \hat{u}_2(\varpi_A, R), \hat{u}_3(\varpi_A, R) \rangle = \langle 4.8333, 8, 7.5 \rangle$, and $sw(\mathsf{u}, \mathsf{u}, \mathsf{u}, \varpi_A) = 20.382$, etc. Under g_L, $\langle \underline{u_1}(\varpi_L, R), \underline{u_2}(\varpi_L, R), \underline{u_3}(\varpi_L, R) \rangle = \langle 8, 16, 12 \rangle$, and $sw(\mathsf{e}, \mathsf{e}, \mathsf{e}, \varpi_L) = 4$.

4 Comparison

[Bouveret and Lang, 2011] studied what are the sequential policies maximizing social welfare. They considered a utilitarian principle and an egalitarian principle, in which the social welfare induced by a sequential policy π is measured

[3] Intuitively, u and e denote the utilitarian principle and the egalitarian principle in social welfare aggregation, respectively.

Table 1: π^*, $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_{\pi^*})$, and $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ under g_B

	$n=2$			$n=3$			$n=4$		
m	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A
4	22	12.292	12.292	31	13.083	13.297	4	13.583	13.885
5	221	18.625	18.625	32	20.033	20.382	41	20.800	21.351
6	222	26.396	26.396	33	28.622	28.840	42	29.600	30.377
7	2221	35.396	35.396	331	38.511	38.864			
8	2222	45.820	45.820	332	49.936	50.381			
9	22221	57.487	57.487						
10	22222	70.569	70.569						

Table 2: π^*, $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_{\pi^*})$, and $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ under g_L

	$n=2$			$n=3$			$n=4$		
m	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A
4	22	20.458	20.458	31	23.000	23.460	4	24.417	25.458
5	221	44.725	44.725	32	51.933	53.028	41	56.350	58.477
6	222	95.371	95.371	33	114.27	115.63	42	125.26	129.80
7	2221	199.49	199.49	331	244.64	247.13			
8	2222	412.91	412.91	332	516.09	520.79			
9	22221	847.64	847.64						
10	22222	1731.0	1731.0						

Table 3: π^*, $sw(\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_{\pi^*})$, and $sw(\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ under g_B

	$n=2$			$n=3$			$n=4$		
m	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A
4	221	6.000	6.146	33	3.750	4.432	4	2.500	3.471
5	1222	9.000	9.313	332	5.000	6.794	44	4.500	5.338
6	2221	13.125	13.198	3321	9.000	9.613	443	5.833	7.594
7	12222	17.333	17.698	32133	12.250	12.955			
8	22212	22.725	22.910	11332232	15.000	16.794			
9	122222	28.429	28.744						
10	2212221	35.200	35.285						

Table 4: π^*, $sw(\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_{\pi^*})$, and $sw(\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ under g_L

	$n=2$			$n=3$			$n=4$		
m	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A	π^*	sw_{π^*}	sw_A
4	221	10.000	10.229	33	7.000	7.820	4	3.750	6.365
5	222	21.667	22.363	332	16.000	17.676	44	12.400	14.619
6	2221	47.500	47.686	3321	36.533	38.543	443	29.333	32.450
7	2222	98.400	99.745	33213	80.229	82.377			
8	22221	205.40	206.46	332132	168.14	173.60			
9	222211	421.59	423.82						
10	222212	862.79	865.50						

by the values of $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_\pi)$ and $sw(\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_\pi)$, respectively. They computed the optimal sequential policies for small numbers of objects and agents using an exhaustive search algorithm, and further conjectured that the problem of finding an optimal sequential policy is NP-hard. It has been proved that the alternating policy (i.e., $1212\ldots$) maximizes the value of $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_\pi)$ for two agents under Borda scoring function [Kalinowski *et al.*, 2013a]. However, the general problem (i.e., finding a sequential policy maximizing the value of $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_\pi)$ and $sw(\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_\pi)$, for more than two agents, or under other scoring functions) is still open.

On another hand, parallel policy ϖ_A (i.e., all–reporting) is very natural and simple, and does not have costly procedures like finding optimal sequence in sequential protocol. By applying ϖ_A, every agent has a chance to get a remaining object in every round of the parallel allocation process. But we don't know if $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ and $sw(\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ can be computed in polynomial time. We conjecture it's much harder than computing $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_\pi)$ and $sw(\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_\pi)$, because complications arise not only from uncertainty over profiles but from uncertainty over lots.

In this section, we will compare the parallel protocol (applying ϖ_A) and the sequential protocol (applying the optimal sequential policies) with respect to several social welfare criteria. We demonstrate experimentally that in most cases, ϖ_A is better than sequential policies. To sum up, the parallel protocol is promising.

We first compare ϖ_A and sequential policies with respect to the utilitarian criterion considered by Bouveret and Lang, which are $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ and $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_\pi)$, respectively. For small numbers of objects and agents (i.e., m and n), we compute the optimal sequential policies (denoted by π^*) and $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_{\pi^*})$ by use of the tool provided by Bouveret and Lang (http:// recherche.noiraudes.net/en/sequences.php), and compute $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ by use of an exhaustive method (on a PC *Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-3570K @3.4Ghz*). The time required to compute $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ grows dramatically in the number n of agents and in the number m of objects. We find that with $n = 3$ and $m = 8$ the computation of $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ requires about 8 minutes, but $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ can not be computed in 12 hours with $n = 3$ and $m = 9$. The results under Borda and Lexicographic scoring functions (i.e., g_B and g_L) are shown in Table 1 and Table 2[4], respectively. From Table 1 and Table 2, we can get that when $n = 2$ and $10 \geq m \geq 4$, the values of π^* and ϖ_A are equal; however, when $n > 2$, the values of ϖ_A are strictly greater than those of π^*. These results suggest that, for small numbers of agents and objects, we could have a better utilitarian social welfare if we apply ϖ_A rather than ϖ_{π^*}. We conjecture that it is not a coincidence, but we could not find a proof.

Conjecture 1 *Under any convex scoring function g and for any number $m \geq n$ of objects, $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_{\pi^*}) = sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ when $n = 2$, and $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_{\pi^*}) < sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ when $n > 2$.*

We also compare ϖ_A and sequential policies with respect to the egalitarian criterion considered by Bouveret and Lang. The results under g_B and g_L are shown in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively. We find that the values of ϖ_A are strictly greater than those of π^* in all the test cases. In fact, ϖ_A is insensitive to identities. So according to Lemma 1, $sw(\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A) = 1/n \cdot sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$, which is definitely the fairest way to divide $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$. However, sequential policies are sensitive to identities. From Conjecture 1, we further conjecture that ϖ_A will always be a better choice than any sequential policy for the balance of utilitarianism and egalitarianism.

Conjecture 2 *Under any convex scoring function g, for any number n of agents and any number $m \geq n$ of objects, $sw(\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_{\pi^*}) < sw(\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$.*

[Kalinowski *et al.*, 2012] considered a different egalitarian principle in which the social welfare induced by a sequential

[4]Note that in Tables 1 to 4, $\underline{n}$, sw_{π^*}, and sw_A denote the sequence $12\ldots n$, the social welfare induced by π^* and ϖ_A.

Table 5: π^*, $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\varpi_{\pi^*})$, and $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ under g_B when $n=2$

m	π^*	$sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\varpi_{\pi^*})$	$sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$
2	12	1.500	1.750
3	122	3.000	3.500
4	1221	5.667	5.958
5	12122	8.483	8.992
6	121221	12.397	12.736
7	1212122	16.560	17.082
8	12122121	21.738	22.129

policy π is measured by the value of $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\varpi_\pi)$. They also computed the optimal sequential policies (denoted by π^*) under g_B when $n=2$ and $p\le 8$. We compute the values of $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\varpi_{\pi^*})$ and $sw(\mathsf{u},\mathsf{e},\mathsf{u},\varpi_A)$ by use of an exhaustive method. The result is shown in Table 5. Again, ϖ_A outperforms sequential policies in all the test cases.

5 Strategical Issues under ϖ_A

In this section, we will discuss strategical issues under all–reporting policy ϖ_A, which is one of the simplest parallel policies that are insensitive to identities. As most collective decision mechanisms, ϖ_A is not *strategyproof*. See Example 2. If all the agents play sincerely, i.e., report their preferred object at each stage, then $\hat{u}_1(\varpi_A,R)=\frac{1}{2}g(1)+\frac{1}{2}g(2)+\frac{1}{3}g(5)$ and $\underline{u_1}(\varpi_A,R)=0$. Suppose 1 is a pessimist and believes that she cannot win any lottery. Then she is concerned only with the utility she can get regardless of uncertainty. If 1 knows other agents' preferences and plays strategically, then she reports o_2 first and she can get $g(2)$ units of utility at least, which is better than $0=\underline{u_1}(\varpi_A,R)$.

Someone may want to study the impact of strategic behavior on the complete-information extensive-form game of such parallel allocation procedures [5]. However, it is supposed that the environment matches decentralized elicitation-free protocols' application motivation. That is to say, we suppose that it is hard to learn self-interested agents' preferences in advance [6]. So we accept the assumption made in [Bouveret and Lang, 2011], i.e., all agents but the only one manipulator act truthfully. In the following discussion, without loss of generality, let 1 be the manipulator that knows the rankings of the other agents (i.e., $\langle\succ_2,\ldots,\succ_n\rangle$), and $o_1\succ_1 o_2\succ_1\ldots\succ_1 o_m$.

Under ϖ_A, a *strategy* for agent 1 is a sequence of objects $\tau=o'_1,\ldots,o'_T$ s.t. $\forall t,t'\in\{1,\ldots,T\}$ ($o'_t\in\mathcal{O}$ and $o'_t=o'_{t'}$ iff $t=t'$) holds. That is to say, τ specifies which object 1 should report at any stage $1\le t\le T$. Some strategies may fail because some object that 1 intends to report has already been allocated. We say strategy τ is *well–defined* with respect to $\langle\succ_2,\ldots,\succ_n\rangle$ if at any stage $t\in\{1,\ldots,T\}$, object o'_t is still available, and there is no object available after stage T.

A manipulation problem M (for agent 1) consists of $\langle\succ_2,\ldots,\succ_n\rangle$, and a target set of objects $\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{O}$. A well-defined strategy τ is *successful* for M if, assuming the agents 2 to n act sincerely, τ ensures that agent 1 gets all objects in $\mathcal{S}$. Solving M consists in determining whether there exists a successful strategy. Below we show that the manipulation problem M can be solved in polynomial time. First, we define some notions: for every $i\in\mathcal{N}$, $A,B\subseteq\mathcal{O}$ s.t. $A\cap B=\emptyset$, $\textsc{Better}_i(A,B)=\{o\in A|(\forall o'\in B)o\succ_i o'\}$, and $\textsc{Best}_i(A)=o\in A$ s.t. $o\succ_i o'$ for every $o'\in A\setminus\{o\}$. We can get Lemma 2 directly.

Lemma 2 *Let $A\subseteq C\subseteq\mathcal{O}$, $B\subseteq D\subseteq\mathcal{O}$, and $C\cap D=\emptyset$. Then for any $i\in\mathcal{N}$, $\textsc{Better}_i(A,D)\subseteq\textsc{Better}_i(C,D)\subseteq\textsc{Better}_i(C,B)$, and if $\textsc{Best}_i(C)\in A$ then $\textsc{Best}_i(C)=\textsc{Best}_i(A)$, otherwise $\textsc{Best}_i(C)\succ_i\textsc{Best}_i(A)$.*

Second, for a target set $\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{O}$, we construct a sequence $\rho_\mathcal{S}=\langle\mathcal{O}'_1,\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{O}_1\rangle,\langle\mathcal{O}'_2,\mathcal{S}_2,\mathcal{O}_2\rangle,\ldots$ as follows:

- $\mathcal{O}'_1=\mathcal{O},\mathcal{N}'=\{2,\ldots,n\}$;
- $\mathcal{S}_k=\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{N}'}\textsc{Better}_i(\mathcal{O}'_k\cap\mathcal{S},\mathcal{O}'_k\setminus\mathcal{S})$;
- $\mathcal{O}_k=\{o\in\mathcal{O}'_k\setminus\mathcal{S}|(\exists i\in\mathcal{N}')o=\textsc{Best}_i(\mathcal{O}'_k\setminus\mathcal{S})\}$;
- $\mathcal{O}'_{k+1}=\mathcal{O}'_k\setminus(\mathcal{S}_k\cup\mathcal{O}_k)$.

Obviously, for every $o\in\mathcal{O}$, there exists one and only $k\ge 1$ s.t. $o\in\mathcal{S}_k\cup\mathcal{O}_k$. We denote by $\mathsf{app}_\mathcal{S}(o)$ the number k.

Lemma 3 *Let $\mathcal{S}'\subseteq\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{O}$, $\rho_{\mathcal{S}'}=\langle\mathcal{O}'_1,\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{O}_1\rangle,\langle\mathcal{O}'_2,\mathcal{S}_2,\mathcal{O}_2\rangle,\ldots$, and $\rho_\mathcal{S}=\langle\mathcal{O}''_1,\mathcal{S}^*_1,\mathcal{O}^*_1\rangle,\langle\mathcal{O}''_2,\mathcal{S}^*_2,\mathcal{O}^*_2\rangle,\ldots$. Then for every $k\ge1$ we have $\bigcup_{t\ge1}^k\mathcal{S}_t\subseteq\bigcup_{t\ge1}^k\mathcal{S}^*_t$ and $\bigcup_{t\ge1}^k(\mathcal{S}_t\cup\mathcal{O}_t)\subseteq\bigcup_{t\ge1}^k(\mathcal{S}^*_t\cup\mathcal{O}^*_t)$.*

PROOF. (Sketch) According to Lemma 2, we have $\mathcal{S}_1\subseteq\mathcal{S}^*_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_1\cup\mathcal{O}_1\subseteq\mathcal{S}^*_1\cup\mathcal{O}^*_1$. Now assume that $\bigcup_{t\ge1}^k\mathcal{S}_t\subseteq\bigcup_{t\ge1}^k\mathcal{S}^*_t$ and $\bigcup_{t\ge1}^k(\mathcal{S}_t\cup\mathcal{O}_t)\subseteq\bigcup_{t\ge1}^k(\mathcal{S}^*_t\cup\mathcal{O}^*_t)$ for any $k<p$. Then $\mathcal{O}'_p\supseteq\mathcal{O}''_p$. Let $\mathcal{N}'=\{2,\ldots,n\}$.

1. According Lemma 2, $\mathcal{S}_p=\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{N}'}\textsc{Better}_i(\mathcal{O}'_p\cap\mathcal{S}',\mathcal{O}'_p\setminus\mathcal{S}')\subseteq\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{N}'}\textsc{Better}_i(\mathcal{O}'_p\cap\mathcal{S},\mathcal{O}''_p\setminus\mathcal{S})$. Pick an object o from $\mathcal{S}_p$. If $o\in\mathcal{O}''_p\cap\mathcal{S}$ then there must be $i\in\mathcal{N}'$ s.t. $o\in\textsc{Better}_i(\mathcal{O}''_p\cap\mathcal{S},\mathcal{O}''_p\setminus\mathcal{S})$, i.e., $o\in\mathcal{S}^*_p$. Otherwise $o\in(\mathcal{O}'_p\setminus\mathcal{O}''_p)\cap\mathcal{S}$, i.e., there must be some $q<p$ s.t. $o\in\mathcal{S}^*_q$. So according to the assumption, we have $\bigcup_{t\ge1}^p\mathcal{S}_t\subseteq\bigcup_{t\ge1}^p\mathcal{S}^*_t$.
2. Pick an object o' from $\mathcal{O}_p$. Then there exists $i\in\mathcal{N}'$ s.t. $o'=\textsc{Best}_i(\mathcal{O}'_p\setminus\mathcal{S}')$. It is easy to find that $\mathcal{O}''_p\setminus\mathcal{S}\subseteq\mathcal{O}'_p\setminus\mathcal{S}'$. So if $o'\in\mathcal{O}''_p\setminus\mathcal{S}$ then $o'=\textsc{Best}_i(\mathcal{O}''_p\setminus\mathcal{S})$, i.e., $o'\in\mathcal{O}^*_p$. If $o'\in\mathcal{S}$ then there exists some $q\le p$ s.t. $o'\in\mathcal{S}^*_q$. Otherwise (i.e., $o'\in\mathcal{O}'_p\setminus(\mathcal{O}''_p\cup\mathcal{S})$) there exists some $q'<p$ s.t. $o'\in\mathcal{O}^*_{q'}$.

According to items 1 and 2 and the assumption, we have $\bigcup_{t\ge1}^p\mathcal{S}_t\subseteq\bigcup_{t\ge1}^p\mathcal{S}^*_t$ and $\bigcup_{t\ge1}^p(\mathcal{S}_t\cup\mathcal{O}_t)\subseteq\bigcup_{t\ge1}^p(\mathcal{S}^*_t\cup\mathcal{O}^*_t)$. □

Now we can give a simple characterization of successful strategies in manipulation problems.

Theorem 1 *Let $M=\langle\langle\succ_2,\ldots,\succ_n\rangle,\mathcal{S}\rangle$ be a manipulation problem, and $\rho_\mathcal{S}=\langle\mathcal{O}''_1,\mathcal{S}^*_1,\mathcal{O}^*_1\rangle,\langle\mathcal{O}''_2,\mathcal{S}^*_2,\mathcal{O}^*_2\rangle,\ldots$. There exists a successful strategy for M iff for any $k\ge1$ we have $k>|\bigcup_{1\le t\le k}\mathcal{S}^*_t|$. Moreover, in this case any strategy τ starting by reporting the objects in $\mathcal{S}$, and reporting o before*

[5] In [Kalinowski *et al.*, 2013b], the allocation procedure applying the sequential protocol, is viewed as a finite repeated game with perfect information, where all agents act strategically.

[6] In the environments where every agent can learn other agent's preferences in advance, centralized allocation methods need to be taken into consideration instead. Because in these cases, the prerequisite to the protection of private preferences is ruined.

stage $\mathsf{app}_{\mathcal{S}}(o)$ *for every* $o \in \mathcal{S}$*, (and completed so as to be well-defined) is successful.*

PROOF. (Sketch) We prove the statement by induction on the size of the target set $\mathcal{S}$. In the case when $\mathcal{S}$ is a singleton $\{o\}$, it is easy to find that $|\bigcup_{1\leq t\leq k}\mathcal{S}_t^*| \leq |\{o\}| = 1$ for every $k \geq 1$. So $\mathcal{S}_1^* = \emptyset$ (i.e., $\mathsf{app}_{\mathcal{S}}(o) > 1$) iff $k > |\bigcup_{1\leq t\leq k}\mathcal{S}_t^*|$ for any $k \geq 1$. If $\mathcal{S}_1^* = \emptyset$ (i.e., no agent in $\{2,\ldots,n\}$ reports o at stage 1) then 1 can get o by reporting o first. If $\mathcal{S}_1^* \neq \emptyset$ (i.e., there must be some agent in $\{2,\ldots,n\}$ reporting o at stage 1) then there exists no successful strategy for M.

Now assume that the statement holds for any target set whose size is no more than $p-1$. Consider a target set $\mathcal{S} = \{o_1',\ldots,o_p'\}$ s.t. $\mathsf{app}_{\mathcal{S}}(o_1') \leq \ldots \leq \mathsf{app}_{\mathcal{S}}(o_p')$. Then $k > |\bigcup_{1\leq t\leq k}\mathcal{S}_t^*|$ for any $k \geq 1$ iff $k > |\bigcup_{1\leq t\leq k}\mathcal{S}_t^*|$ for any $p \geq k \geq 1$. Let $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S}\setminus\{o_p'\}$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{S}'} = \langle\mathcal{O}_1',\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{O}_1\rangle, \langle\mathcal{O}_2',\mathcal{S}_2,\mathcal{O}_2\rangle,\ldots$.

- If $k > |\bigcup_{1\leq t\leq k}\mathcal{S}_t^*|$ for any $p \geq k \geq 1$ then:
  1. $\mathsf{app}_{\mathcal{S}}(o_p') > |\bigcup_{1\leq t\leq \mathsf{app}_{\mathcal{S}}(o_p')}\mathcal{S}_t^*| = p$. So $o_p' \notin \bigcup_{t\geq 1}^{p}(\mathcal{S}_t^*\cup\mathcal{O}_t^*)$. From Lemma 3, we have $o_p' \notin \bigcup_{t\geq 1}^{p}(\mathcal{S}_t\cup\mathcal{O}_t) \subseteq \bigcup_{t\geq 1}^{p}(\mathcal{S}_t^*\cup\mathcal{O}_t^*)$ and $k > |\bigcup_{1\leq t\leq k}\mathcal{S}_t^*| \geq |\bigcup_{1\leq t\leq k}\mathcal{S}_t|$ for any $p \geq k \geq 1$.
  2. According to item 1 and the assumption, there exists a successful strategy τ' for $\langle\langle\succ_2,\ldots,\succ_n\rangle,\mathcal{S}'\rangle$ starting by reporting the objects in $\mathcal{S}'$.
  3. According to items 1 and 2, if at each stage $k < p$, 1 reports the object specified by τ', then o_p' is available and not reported by any $i \in \{2,\ldots,n\}$ at stage p. Let τ be a well–defined strategy reporting the object specified by τ' at any stage $k < p$, and reporting o_p' at stage p. It is easy to find that τ is successful for M.
- If there exists some $p \geq k \geq 1$ s.t. $k \leq |\bigcup_{1\leq t\leq k}\mathcal{S}_t^*|$, then there must be some $i \in \{2,\ldots,n\}$ reporting some $o \in \bigcup_{1\leq t\leq k}\mathcal{S}_t^*$ at some stage $k' \leq k$. In this case, there is no successful strategy for M.

So the statement holds for any target set whose size is p. □

We develop Algorithm 1 (in which the set of objects $\mathcal{O} = \{o_1,\ldots,o_m\}$ and the set of agents $\mathcal{N} = \{1,\ldots,n\}$ are supposed to be global variables) to find successful strategies. The soundness and and completeness of the algorithm is from the proof of Theorem 1. It is not hard to find that Algorithm 1 always terminates and is polynomial in m and n.

Algorithm 1: Finding a successful strategy τ for M

input: a manipulation problem $M = \langle\langle\succ_2,\ldots,\succ_n\rangle,\mathcal{S}\rangle$
output: a successful strategy τ for M if it exists, otherwise failure;

1. $\mathcal{O}' \leftarrow \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{S}' \leftarrow \mathcal{S}, size \leftarrow 0, \tau \leftarrow \varepsilon, \tau' \leftarrow \varepsilon,$ $\mathcal{N}' \leftarrow \{2,\ldots,n\}, k \leftarrow 1;$ /* Initialization */
2. **while**$(\mathcal{O}' \neq \emptyset)$
3. $\quad\mathcal{S}^* \leftarrow \bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{N}'}\textsc{Better}_i(\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{O}'\setminus\mathcal{S}');$
4. $\quad size \leftarrow size + |\mathcal{S}^*|;$
5. $\quad$**if** $size \geq k$ **then return** failure;
6. $\quad$**for** all $o \in \mathcal{S}^*$
7. $\quad\quad\tau \leftarrow \tau \bullet o;$ /* $\bullet$ denotes connection*/
8. $\quad\mathcal{O}^* \leftarrow \{o \in \mathcal{O}'\setminus\mathcal{S}' | (\exists i \in \mathcal{N}')o = \textsc{Best}_i(\mathcal{O}'\setminus\mathcal{S}')\};$
9. $\quad$**if** $k > |\mathcal{S}|$ and $\mathcal{O}^* \neq \emptyset$
10. $\quad\quad$randomly pick an object o from $\mathcal{O}^*$;
11. $\quad\quad\tau' \leftarrow \tau' \bullet o$; /*completed so as to be well–defined*/
12. $\quad\mathcal{O}' \leftarrow \mathcal{O}'\setminus(\mathcal{S}^*\cup\mathcal{O}^*), \mathcal{S}' \leftarrow \mathcal{S}'\setminus\mathcal{S}^*, k \leftarrow k+1;$
13. **return** $\tau \bullet \tau'$;

We say a well-defined strategy τ is *optimal* (in the sense of pessimism) if it maximizes 1's benefit under the assumption that 1 can not win any lottery. In fact, it is not hard to find that if agent 1's scoring function is g_L then she can find an optimal strategy (in the sense of pessimism) in polynomial time by applying Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: Finding an optimal strategy

input: a profile $R = \langle\succ_1,\ldots,\succ_n\rangle$
output: an optimal strategy τ in the sense of pessimism

1. $\mathcal{O}' \leftarrow \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{S} \leftarrow \emptyset;$ /* Initialization */
2. $\tau \leftarrow$ **Algorithm 1**$(\langle\succ_2,\ldots,\succ_n\rangle,\emptyset);$
3. **while**$(\mathcal{O}' \neq \emptyset)$
4. $\quad o \leftarrow \textsc{Best}_1(\mathcal{O}'), \mathcal{O}' \leftarrow \mathcal{O}'\setminus\{o\};$
5. $\quad\tau' \leftarrow$ **Algorithm 1**$(\langle\succ_2,\ldots,\succ_n\rangle,\mathcal{S}\cup\{o\});$
6. $\quad$**if** $\tau' \neq$ failure
7. $\quad\quad\tau \leftarrow \tau', \mathcal{S} \leftarrow \mathcal{S}\cup\{o\};$
8. **return** τ;

Let's run Algorithm 2 on the profile R given in Example 1. Then $\{o_2\}$, i.e., the best set of objects that 1 can manage to get is found, and a successful strategy for the set (i.e, o_2, o_3 or o_2, o_5) is returned. We conjecture that under the Borda scoring function g_B, the problem of finding an optimal strategy is NP-hard, but we do not have a proof.

6 Conclusion

We have defined and studied a parallel elicitation-free protocol for allocating indivisible goods. The protocol is parameterized by a parallel policy (i.e., an agent selection policy), which can consider the allocation history that had happened. We have compared a special parallel policy (i.e., ϖ_A) with sequential policies for small numbers of objects and agents with respect to the three social welfare criteria considered in [Bouveret and Lang, 2011] and [Kalinowski *et al.*, 2012]. The results show that ϖ_A outperforms the optimal sequential policies in most cases. We have also proved that an agent who knows the preferences of other agents can find in polynomial time whether she has a successful strategy for a target set; and that if the scoring function of the manipulator is g_L, she could compute an optimal strategy (in the sense of pessimism) in polynomial time.

There are several directions for future work. One direction would be to prove the conjectures about the social welfare induced by ϖ_A, and to design other parallel policies that can outperform ϖ_A in some social welfare criterion. Another direction would be to find the missing complexity results for manipulation under g_B, and to consider strategical issues under the assumption that the manipulator believes any lottery is fair. Furthermore, we plan to design an elicitation-free protocol for allocating sharable goods [Airiau and Endriss, 2010].

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant No.61070232, No.61105039, No.61272295, and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Issue Number WK0110000026). Many thanks to the anonymous reviewers for their comments.

References

[Airiau and Endriss, 2010] Stéphane Airiau and Ulle Endriss. Multiagent resource allocation with sharable items: simple protocols and nash equilibria. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, AAMAS '10, pages 167–174, Richland, SC, 2010. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.

[Bouveret and Lang, 2011] Sylvain Bouveret and Jérôme Lang. A general elicitation-free protocol for allocating indivisible goods. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second international joint conference on Artificial Intelligence*, IJCAI'11, pages 73–78. AAAI Press, 2011.

[Brams *et al.*, 2012] Steven J. Brams, D. Marc Kilgour, and Christian Klamler. The undercut procedure: an algorithm for the envy-free division of indivisible items. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 39:615–631, 2012.

[Budish and Cantillon, 2012] E. Budish and E. Cantillon. The multi-unit assignment problem: Theory and evidence from course allocation at harvard. *American Economic Review*, 102(5):2237–71, 2012.

[Chen *et al.*, 2010] Yiling Chen, John K. Lai, David C. Parkes, and Ariel D. Procaccia. Truth, justice, and cake cutting. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, AAAI'10, pages 756–761. AAAI Press, 2010.

[Chevaleyre *et al.*, 2010] Y. Chevaleyre, U. Endriss, and N. Maudet. Simple negotiation schemes for agents with simple preferences: sufficiency, necessity and maximality. *JAAMAS*, 20(2):234–259, 2010.

[Cramton *et al.*, 2006] P. Cramton, Y. Shoham, and R. Steinberg. *Combinatorial Auctions*. MIT Press, 2006.

[Kalinowski *et al.*, 2012] T. Kalinowski, N. Narodytska, T. Walsh, and L. Xia. Strategic behavior in a decentralized protocol for allocating indivisible goods. In *Proceedings of Fourth International Workshop on Computational Social Choice*, COMSOC'12, 2012.

[Kalinowski *et al.*, 2013a] T. Kalinowski, N. Narodytska, and T. Walsh. A socialwelfare optimal sequential allocation procedure. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third international joint conference on Artificial Intelligence*, IJCAI'13. AAAI Press, 2013.

[Kalinowski *et al.*, 2013b] T. Kalinowski, N. Narodytska, T. Walsh, and L. Xia. Strategic behavior when allocating indivisible goods sequentially. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, AAAI'13. AAAI Press, 2013.